

REMARKS

The office action has been carefully considered together with the newly cited prior art and amendments have been made to claims 1, 12 and 21 in an effort to place the application in condition for immediate allowance. The examiner has rejected claims 1 and 2 as being anticipated by Reich and has rejected claims 3, 12, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Reich in view of Lewin.

As a result of the amendments that were made to claim 1, it is now believed that this claim is neither anticipated, taught nor suggested by Reich, either applied singularly or in combination with any of the other prior art patents of record. The examiner's rejection is based on the structure of Reich which has a pin 84 which is engageable with holes 58 that the examiner asserts are equivalent to the recesses that were claimed. The pin 84 is insertable into the holes 58 and prevents vertical movement of the depth detent mechanism in either direction which was part of the claim language prior to the present amendment.

The amendments that have been made to claim 1 are intended to emphasize the significant differences that exist between the present invention and the Reich patent. In this regard, claim 1 now recites a saw blade adjustment detent mechanism as claimed which has, *inter alia*, each recess having diverging surfaces for releasably engaging said saw blade detent while permitting disengagement from said detent from a recess responsive to pivotal movement of said foot relative to said detent to provide a plurality of predetermined saw

blade position settings within said range of saw blade positions. The releasable engagement as claimed which can be achieved responsive to movement of the foot relative to the detent is not anticipated, taught or suggested by Reich. No amount of force applied to the foot of Reich's structure will result in the pin 84 being released from the recess holes 58. The operation of the circular saw of applicant's claim 1 is significantly more convenient to use and enables easy readjustment of the position of the saw blade within a range of positions.

With regard to the circular saw claimed in claim 12, Reich's pin 84 that is engageable with holes 58 does not teach or suggest a bevel angle adjustment detent mechanism that comprises, *inter alia*, a detent holding assembly carrying a pivotable bevel angle detent with a pivot axis on one end portion and a transverse ridge spaced from said pivot axis, and an articulate member defining a plurality of spaced bevel angle recesses, each matingly and releasably engageable with said transverse ridge of said bevel angle to provide predetermined bevel angle settings within said range of bevel angles, wherein said detent is disengaged from a recess responsive to a releasing force being applied to said foot. Nor does Reich teach or suggest a saw blade depth adjustment detent mechanism that comprises, *inter alia*, a saw blade depth detent having a pivot axis on one end portion and a transverse ridge spaced from said pivot axis, said end with said transverse ridge being biased toward a second member having a plurality of spaced saw blade depth recesses, each recess being matingly and releasably engageable with said transverse ridge of said saw blade depth detent to thereby provide a plurality of predetermined saw blade depth settings within the range of


said saw blade depths, said detent being disengaged from a recess responsive to a releasing force being applied to said foot. The Reich structure is designed to be adjusted to various settings by removing the pin 84 from the holes 58 and is incapable of being moved responsive to a releasing force being applied to said foot. Moreover, the Reich structure does not have a saw blade depth detent having a pivot axis on one end portion and a transverse ridge spaced from said pivot axis nor does it have a pivotable bevel angle detent with a pivot axis on one end portion and a transverse ridge spaced from said pivot axis. Because the circular saw claimed in claim 21 has similar structure to that set forth in claim 12, it is also believed that Reich fails to teach or suggest this claim as well.

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicants submit that all pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Roger D. Greer
Registration No. 26,174

January 5, 2006

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978